

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 8 currently remain in the application. Claims 2 -7 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 8 are herein amended.

Claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected in said Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Murata. At least in part in view of this cited reference and the reason for rejection by the Examiner, independent claims 1 and 8 are herein amended to limit the adhesive agents to be of acrylic polymer and the peeling sheet to be of polyethylene terephthalate. With this amend herein effected, it is believed that the rejection of the Examiner is obviated.

Murata relates to heat-peelable adhesive sheets for temporarily attaching a semiconductor wafer during its dicing process. By contrast, the adhesive tape of the present invention is for fastening a polishing pad which is not intended to be removable by heating, unlike the sheets considered by Murata. In summary, their purposes are different and their physical properties are different. Neither can be used in place of the other for this reason.

According to Murata, the separator 4 is not always necessary and, if it is used, it is a conventional kind of release paper ([0036]). There is no suggestion that PET be used as the separator, and there is no statement by the Examiner to the effect that persons skilled in the art would commonly consider the use of PET as a separator in the manufacture of an adhesive tape.

The present invention is based on the results of experimental research in search for a suitable material for use as a separator for an adhesive tape. As Table 2 clearly shows, the present invention is characterized as providing an adhesive tape having center line average roughness substantially on the order of  $0.1\mu\text{m}$ , and this is made possible and the polishing efficiency is improved only because acrylic polymer is used as adhesive agent and PET as a separator.

Thus, as stated above, the present invention is for a different purpose and discloses a product using different materials. It should therefore be concluded that this reference cannot predicate the Examiner's rejection on the ground of obviousness. In other words, it is

believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura  
Registration No. 29,093

January 12, 2006  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP  
500 12th Street, Suite 200  
Oakland, California 94607  
Telephone: (510) 663-1100  
Telefax: (510) 663-0920